

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. Independent claims 1, 11, 20, 21, 29, 34 and 40 have been amended. Claims 1 – 44 are presented for examination. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 – 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants have amended the independent claims in response to this rejection. With regards to the previously-claimed “parameters,” Applicants have removed all references to “parameters” and have replaced the term “parameters” with the term “data.” Exemplary support for such a data-driven definition of the claimed explorers is found in the present specification at paragraphs 126-128. With regards to the previously-claimed “search engine,” the claims now recite a “query-execution” engine. Exemplary support for such an engine for executing queries is found in the present specification at paragraphs 55, 78, 92 and 123.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 – 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hahn, *et al.*, U. S. Patent No. 5,751,287 (“Hahn”) in view of Straub, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,905,492 (“Straub”). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, 20, 21, 29, 34 and 40 in response to this rejection. For instance, claim 1 now requires “an explorer residing as one of said plurality of items in said data store and housing a first set of data and a second set of data, wherein said first set of data defines a *query* that identifies one or more desired field entries, and wherein said data set of parameters defines an explorer display schema having one or more visual elements selected for display with items having said one or more desired field entries.”

Claim 11 includes similar claim language. Claims 29, 34 and 40, as amended, now require “storing an item in a data store as an explorer, wherein said explorer houses a set of data defining said query and said explorer display schema” and “in response to said user input, executing a set of instructions that reads said set of data from said item, wherein said executing further includes querying said data store by utilizing said query to select one or more items having said desired field entry” Similar claim language is now found in claims 20 and 21. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Hahn nor Straub, either alone or in combination, teaches these claim elements.

To teach the above-mentioned claim limitations, the Office Action relies on Straub. *See, e.g.*, Office Action, pages 3 and 4. Straub addresses “themes” that may be applied to a user interface, i.e., the desktop screen. A theme provides a group of multi-media resources for enhancing displays in a graphical user interface to an operating system of a computer according to a topic of the theme. When utilizing Straub’s invention, the “theme’s resources are periodically updated by retrieving updating resources from a remote computer at which the updating resources are stored by a theme provider, so as to provide continually updating enhancements to the graphical user interface display consistent with the theme’s topic.” Straub, Abstract. As such, Straub’s invention allows “customization of and integration of multimedia resources into a graphical user interface of an operating system of a computer, and more particularly . . . [allows] integration of themed multimedia resources into the graphical user interface.” Straub, Field of Invention.

Straub, however, is devoid of any discussion of “data” defining a “query” that identifies the characteristics of those items to be displayed within a themed-view. Straub applies its themed-views in the environment provided by a traditional file-based organization of items, as

provided by the Microsoft Windows 95 operating system. As is well-known, the folders of Microsoft Windows 95 operating system are created with static associations between files and folders. Put simply, Straub does not teach the use of a “query” to define the contents of the themed-folders displayed to the user. Indeed, Straub is concerned with providing themed-views to be used by an operating system, not manipulating the manner in which the operating system organizes displayed items.

In contrast, the independent claims require, “an explorer, wherein said explorer houses a set of data defining said query and said explorer display schema” and “in response to said user input, executing a set of instructions that reads said set of data from said item, wherein said executing further includes querying said data store by utilizing said query to select one or more items having said desired field entry.” Neither reference teaches this aspect of the claimed invention. For instance, as explained by the present specification, one embodiment of the present invention, relies on “virtual item Folders whose membership is based on the results of a specific query (such as in the context of a database), and items that meet the conditions of this query” Present Specification, para. 78. Straub clearly does not teach such virtual item Folders, either as described in the specification or reflected within the claims. Accordingly, while Straub teaches defining theme-based display schemes, Straub does not teach the claimed “explorer” or the claimed execution of a query to select those items (with a desired field entry) for display with a defined display scheme. Hahn also does not teach this aspect of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, 20, 21, 29, 34 and 40 are now in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2 - 10, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect

to claim 1. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 12 - 19, which depend from claim 11, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 11. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 22 - 28, which depend from claim 21, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 21. Applicants submit that dependent claims 30 - 33, which depend from claim 29, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 29. Applicants submit that dependent claims 35 - 39, which depend from claim 34, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 34. Finally, Applicants submit that dependent claims 41 - 44, which depend from claim 40, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 40.

CONCLUSION

If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547